DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 183 453 SO 012 379

AUTHOR Hamilton, David; And Others
TITLE Notes on the Origins of the Educational Terms Class and Curriculum. Discussion Paper.
PUB DATE 14 Feb 80
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 7-11, 1980); Not available in paper copy from EDRS due to fading ink throughout original

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum; *Educational Anthropology; *Educational History; Educational Practice; *Educational Research; Educational Theories; Sociocultural Patterns; Speeches

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the origins of the two educational terms--class and curriculum. The authors believe that an understanding of the origins of key words in education may contribute not only to the history of education but also to the wider development of educational theory. The paper argues that the emergence of classes (in the modern sense) arose not so much from an increase in school size as from shifts in patterns of school attendance. Currently, the earliest known use of class occurs in a description of the University of Paris written by Robert Goulet and printed in 1517. From the 16th century to the Industrial Revolution, the term class developed three distinct meanings. First, it was used in universities and large schools to refer to a cohort of students (e.g., the class of 76). Second, it referred to a teaching room (Goulet's original use). Third, it came to mean a relatively small group of students, usually engaged upon a common task. The paper associates the emergence of curriculum with the rise of Calvinism. The earliest source of the term curriculum in the Oxford English Dictionary is a mention in the records of Glasgow University for 1633. During the Reformation, Glasgow University underwent a series of reorganizations intended to turn the University to more "definitely Protestant ends." In this reorganization process the term curriculum was used. (Author/RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED183453

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Discussion Paper February 14th, 1980

NOTES ON THE ORIGINS OF THE EDUCATIONAL TERMS CLASS AND CURRICULUM

David Hamilton
Department of Education
University of Glasgow
Scotland

&

Maria Gibbons
E. J. Brill
Leiden
Holland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. F. Hamilton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Abstract

This paper has two thrusts. First, it suggests that the emergence of classes in the sixteenth century arose not so much from an increase in school size as from shifts in patterns of school attendance. Second, it associates the later but related emergence of curriculum with the rise of calvinism. Collectively, class and curriculum brought a new 'order' into schooling: classes underpinned the idea of order-as-sequence (cf. first class, second class, etc.); curriculum buttressed the idea of order-as-structure (cf. the calvinist concept of discipline). Overall, the paper argues that an understanding of the origins of key words in education may contribute not only to the history of education but also to the wider development of educational theory.

SP 013 379

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Educational Research Association, Boston. April 7-11, 1980.

'It is hardly possible to exaggerate the importance of this innovation ('the very idea of a "curriculum"') in the history of education'

(Rashdall)[1]

'The division of pupils into classes was to constitute one of the principal pedagogic innovations in the entire history of education'

(Mir)[2]

Certain words in educational discourse, like 'kindergarten', 'interest' and 'teaching machine', are readily linked to particular kinds of educational activity and particular periods of educational history. Other words, like 'timetable', 'progressive' and 'blackboard' are more loosely coupled to a specific context. And at the extreme, there is a third group of words, like class and curriculum, which have become universalised - their origins and location effaced from the memories of educationists and historians alike.

To write, anachronistically, of the 'curriculum' of a medieval university[3] is to evoke images of educational life that are, at best, misleading. Moreover, such distortions can have a disruptive effect. By forcing the schooling of the past into the language of the present, they may overemphasise the continuities of educational history. Uncritical use of 'class' and 'curriculum' may foster the belief that teaching and learning have changed very little, for instance, by comparison with changes in the administration and legislation of schooling. Certainly, historians seem to have neglected the study of teaching and learning. Indeed, as far as we have been able to discover there are no general histories of pedagogy written in English.

But are historians solely to blame for this shortcoming? We do not think so. We believe that the problem rests with the educational community at large - for failing to provide any kind of general framework which historians might use to analyse the specific pedagogies of the past.[4]

This paper, then, should be read as a contribution to such a task. It reports a small part of a much larger research programme. Its basic assumption is that useful access to both the substance and dynamics of education can be gained from an analysis of the rhetoric of schooling. In this account we examine the words 'class' and 'curriculum' since, as suggested below, their contemporaneous emergence in the 16th century is more than merely coincidental.

CLASS

Perhaps the most extensive discussion in English of the origins of classes in schooling can be found in Ariès' Centuries of Childhood.[5] Like others, Ariès notes that although the word class was used in an educational sense in Quintilian's Institutes (circa 100 AD), it appears to be missing from medieval accounts of schooling. Its re-emergence in the 16th century, Ariès argues, can be associated with the influence of Renaissance writers (like Erasmus) who, in an effort to distance themselves from the medieval vulgarisation of Latin, deliberately reintroduced a large corpus of words from classical sources.[6]

Currently, the earliest known use of class occurs in a description of the University of Paris written by Robert Goulet and printed in 1517. Goulet's small volume also outlines a series of precepts - the heptadogma - that might be followed in the founding of a new University. His description of a suitable premises includes the requirement that 'there should be at least twelve classes or small schools according to the exigency of place and auditors'.[7]

In a sense, the juxtaposition of 'class' and 'small school' bears out Ariès' viewpoint (which was adopted without a knowledge of Goulet's writings). Other evidence, however, suggests that classis was more than a simple lexical substitution for schola. We believe that its adoption was also tied up with the new patterns of schooling that began to emerge

in the Renaissance.

During the Middle Ages, advanced education in schools and universities had comprised the teaching and learning of texts and their glosses. Schools (usually taught by one person) were small; and the reading and memorisation of passages was the dominant activity of teaching and learning. Even when scholars were grouped together, it was more for administrative convenience than for any particular educational reason : a 'class' in a medieval university was merely an aggregation of individuals.

The individualisation of medieval schooling manifested itself in other ways. First, there was no need for every student to be learning the same passage. Secondly, there was no pedagogical requirement that students should attend school all the time (they could just as easily memorise their lessons elsewhere). And thirdly, students merely remained with a given teacher until their educational aspirations had been met. The net result was that schooling had quite a different rhythm and harmonisation of teaching, learning and attendance.[8]

Gradually, however, these medieval practices underwent a process of re-ordering. Some indication of the scale and substance of these changes can be appreciated from developments that took place in the Universities of Bologna and Paris, and in the schools supported in the Low Countries by the Brethren of the Common Life.

During the 12th and 13th centuries, students converged on Bologna from all over Europe. They came to study under a group of Jurists

whose writings had offered various novel solutions in the application of Roman law to Medieval circumstances. Denied the same protection as the citizens of Bologna, the students gradually banded together to protect their interests. Thus, although the teaching at Bologna was initially based on contracts with individual masters[9], its organisation increasingly fell within the orbit of the student Guild. In turn, the pedagogy became closely supervised by the students - a 'formidably rigorous'[10] regime sustained via short-term appointments and policed by a system of monetary fines (e.g. for inefficient lecturing).

Despite the extension of student power at Bologna, the pedagogy of the University was little removed from the apprenticeship model. Teachers passed on their vocational knowledge and skills to those seeking a similar position. Further, there was no particular order of studies:[11] students were admitted to the fraternity of teachers after serving their time for seven or eight years, and after having demonstrated their suitability through examination.

As this suggests, even though the Bologna students controlled the organisation of teaching, the masters retained the right to issue credentials. At the outset, the masters merely controlled entry into their own guild; but, later (after 1219), they obtained the right to confer (with the consent of the Archdeacon of Bologna) a licence to teach - the jus ubique docendi - which, throughout the Papal domain, had both ecclesiastical and civic authority.

to supply a steady, but controlled stream of entrants to the local legal profession. However, with the advent of Papal sanction, Bologna changed, in effect, from a Guild into a University. As far as the teachers were concerned the jus ubique docendi was a licence to over-produce; as far as the students were concerned it was an incentive not merely to attend lectures but also to undergo the process of formal accreditation. As a consequence, the jus ubique docendi became more than the trademark of a teacher. It turned into an outward manifestation of a man's learned status (as, for instance, in the practice of putting Master or Mr. in front of a person's name). Armed with the authority to mint a 'hard' currency, universities began to grow in size, prestige, number and power. In turn, certain institutions - notably the University of Paris - yielded to new forms of discipline and management.

The University of Paris was an outgrowth of the local cathedral school. Certain important teachers - notably Peter Abelard - drew large numbers of students and teachers to Paris - many of whom had only tenuously linked with the church schools. By 1215, the external masters (those outside the religious teaching orders) had acquired corporate (i.e. self governing) status and, above all, the same power of licensing as the Chancellor of Notre Dame.

During the 13th century, various people left money to support 'poor' students at the University of Paris. Typically, these endowments were given to establish a small hospice or community of scholars. Such 'houses' or 'colleges' (e.g. the House of Sorbonne, founded in 1257) were essentially secular institutions (i.e. not attached to any particular religious order). Nevertheless, they subjected their scholars to a

similar external rule or discipline. To this extent, Paris was a university run by masters, whereas Bologna was a university run by students.

As the colleges grew in size and resources, they began to take on more of a teaching role (again following the pattern of the regular orders). Nevertheless, control of the subject matter remained with the external authority of the university. By the end of the 15th century, the University of Paris had an interlocking structure embracing college, university, lay and ecclesiastical authorities. For instance, the government of the College of Sorbonne was vested, collectively, in the archdeacon and chancellor of Paris, the doctors of theology, the deans of the faculties of law and medicine, and the rectors and proctors of the university.[12] Although a collegiate institution like Oxford, Paris was run as a university, not as a cluster of disparate colleges.

These changes in the administration of the University of Paris were also reflected in the revision of college statutes. Notably, central control led to a standardisation of procedure within each college and a uniformity of procedure between colleges.[13] The term 'class' made its appearance in this context. It was used, administratively and educationally, to refer to cohorts of students who, in concert, followed the requirements of the Master of Arts degree which, itself, was reorganised as a fixed sequence of books, topics or subjects. Outside the university, these new pedagogic forms became known as the Modus et Ordo Parisiensis.

According to Mir's analysis of the Modus, classes (in the modern sense) were first described (but not named) in the statutes of the College of Montaigu:

> It is in the 1509 programme of Montaigu that one finds for the first time in Paris a precise and clear division of students into classes ... That is, divisions graduated by stages or levels of increasing complexity according to the age and knowledge required by the students.[14]

If, as Mir argues, the College of Montaigu 'inaugurated'[15] the Renaissance class system, it is also clear that, by 1509, its form was relatively well-developed. Insofar as the cited secondary sources are representative, the revision of the college statutes was largely a response to indigenous developments. Yet, various commentators have also suggested that the pre-history of the class system - the division of large schools into smaller classes - owes something to the Brethren of the Common Life - an urban devotional religious movement that, unlike the monks and friars, combined lay and clerical participation with the absence of any Rule or binding vow.

The Brethren have drawn the interest of educational historians largely because their name is associated with many important humanist educators. Besides Erasmus, for instance, the Brethren had a hand in the employment and/or education of John Standonck (Principal of Montaigu from 1483 to 1499) and John Sturm (Founder of the Archetypical Protestant Academy in Strasburg).[16]

The Brethren also differed from their predecessors in another important respect. From the outset, certain members were noted for

their learning and literacy. For instance, their founder, Gerhard Groote (1340-1384) was the son of a magistrate and educated at the Universities of Paris and (possibly) Prague. Even when Groote had abandoned worldly goods, he retained a personal library.

As the Brethren grew in numbers they turned their literacy to good advantage and set themselves up in a relatively new trade of manuscript book production. Just as the foundation of the Brethren had drawn protests from the established clerical orders, so their attempts to follow regular trades (e.g. shoemaking) drew opposition from the municipal guilds. Book production not only resonated with their literacy, it was also an unprotected craft.[17]

In due course, it seems, the Brethren, like the regular orders, began to take boys into their communities. In some cases the boys were 'given' to the Brethren as candidates for future internal promotion; in other cases, they were merely 'loaned' for the purpose of receiving a formal upbringing. Given the literate bias and economic basis of the Brethren's work, writing formed a core activity in the schooling of their young charges - at a time when, elsewhere, the predominant school activities of young men were more likely to be based on oral than literary skills.

Whether the Brethren were unique in this respect is, however, probably irrelevant. Their importance derives from the association of literacy with other factors. For instance, their provision of vernacular as well as latin instruction meant that they attracted the support of wealthy

merchants and artisans. Similarly, their celebration of literacy resulted in the provision of more advanced forms of schooling than usually available in non-university settings. And finally, their book production activities meant that they could retain considerable numbers of poor scholars by putting them to work as apprentice copyists.

Taken together, these factors created a rare combination of circumstances: schools with both large and, above all, stable enrolments. To assume, like Mir and others, that the class system emerged at the same time as large schools is to be trapped by twentieth century thinking and to confuse school attendance with school enrolment. As hinted earlier, the enrolment of a medieval school (as measured by fee payment) had no necessary connection with the levels of attendance. Indeed, enrolment may correlate more highly with annual through-put than daily attendance. Further, levels of attendance yield only limited data about patterns of attendance. (E.g. a stable attendance level of 50% could mean that the same children attend day after day, or that, each day, a different 50% attend). It is for these reasons that stability of school attendance is as pedagogically important to the class system as school size. Then, as now, educational institutions with a high turnover would find it difficult to sustain any regular system of sequential and step-by-step advancement of students.

With a stable enrolment of large numbers of students, division of schools into sub-groups was both reasonable and possible. In principle, however, there were two options: either vertical or horizontal segmentation. Vertical segmentation was the usual procedure: as schools increased in size part of them was hived off to form a separate school.

Horizontal segmentation - the hierarchical division of students - was rather different. It required some kind of overarching sense of order to govern the inter-relationships among the parts.[18] Thus, the choice of graduated groups in the Brethren's schools - an innovation attributed by Hyma to John Cele, a teacher in Zwolle from 1374 to 1417[19] - raised new administrative and pedagogic questions. For example, how many groups were there to be? How should promotion be achieved? And how often?

These questions laid out a relatively new educational agenda - one that both reflected and shaped the emergent form of modern (i.e. post-medieval) schooling. Administratively, too, the fact that the agenda pre-supposed some kind of overarching conception may also help to explain why the class system, in its evolved form, fitted relatively easily into the centralised structures of the University of Paris. Certainly, the agenda did not emerge fully-fledged : its substance and significance took at least a century to become recognised. Yet, in the terms of our analysis, the rate of pedagogical change in the late fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries far exceeds that of the preceeding and following centuries. If our argument holds, it was nothing short of revolutionary.

From the sixteenth century to the Industrial Revolution, the term 'class' developed three distinct meanings. First, it was used in universities and large schools to refer to a cohort of students (cf.'the class of 76'). Secondly, it referred to a teaching room (cf. Goulet's original use). And thirdly, it came to mean a relatively small group of students, usually engaged upon a common task.

In one sense, this last usage could be regarded as a corruption of the first. It may, however, have had a different origin. During the Reformation, the word 'class' also came to refer to the small governing bodies - known in Scotland as Presbyteries - that were a distinct, indeed definitive, feature of certain branches of the Protestant Church.[20] Subsequently, the word class was also taken up by the Methodists and used to refer to Fellowship Groups - of usually less than 12 persons - that formed the smallest unit of church organisation.[21] The origins and career of this post-Reformation usage remain obscure. Did the early protestants adopt class from schooling, or did they draw upon earlier classical usages? Did the use of class in church organisation subsequently become devoid of any educational meaning? Or did it feed directly into the small-group usages of class that, in the nineteenth century, formed the basis of the Lancastrian and classroom systems?[22]

Overall, the adoption of classes imported a new tension into the organisation of schooling. On the one hand, stronger concepts of sequence gave the endeavour a new-found coherence; while on the other hand, the process of educational stratification brought new internal divisions into sharper focus.[23] How, for instance, did the leitmotive of the secular educational ladder fit with the medieval belief that society was a static entity? A full answer to this question cannot be given here; but some pointers are provided by the second focus of our study - the emergence of the term curriculum.

CURRICULUM

By comparison with the scarcity of writings on 'class', equivalent discussions of 'curriculum' are non-existent.[24] By necessity, therefore, our analysis is more tentative. Nonetheless, a convenient starting point is the fact that the earliest source of 'curriculum' in the Oxford English Dictionary is a mention in the records of Glasgow University for 1633. Given the dearth of other materials, the dictionary source left us with two questions. First, was the Glasgow citation historically and geographically significant (or merely a function of the fact that the Oxford English Dictionary was originally edited by a Scotsman)? And second, what prompted seventeenth century educationists to annexe a classical term meaning a race-course? The second question was relatively easy to answer: our earlier conclusions about the emergence of sequencing in schooling fitted plausibly with the adoption of the race-track metaphor. But what of the first question? Why Glasgow? Why 1633?

A preliminary search through the statutes and histories of other universities failed to provide any earlier uses, nor, for that matter, any useable clues. We were forced to reformulate the question rather differently; namely, what was happening in Glasgow at the beginning of the 17th century? Slowly, a defensible explanation emerged.

During the Reformation (i.e. in the century following 1560), Glasgow University underwent a series of reorganisations intended to turn the University to more 'definitely protestant ends'.[25] Briefly, constitutional changes of 1573 and 1577 - the latter promoted by

Andrew Melville, a former teacher of latin at the college of Geneva - provided the university with a new discipline. Residence in college was made compulsory for the Principal; courses were reduced in length; teaching was planned according to a 'rigid programme'[26]; examinations were more closely regulated; and teachers and students were expected to profess the protestant faith and attend compulsory worship.

The earliest usages of curriculum in Glasgow (1633 and 1643) fitted with the race-track metaphor but also, we believe, incorporated a new dimension. They referred, in 1633, to the entire course[27] of the Master of Arts degree and, in 1643, to the complete class-based course of Glasgow Grammar School[28] (the University's main feeder institution). In both instances, that is, curriculum was used in an overarching sense; it did not apply to segments of the arts degree or to parts of the Grammar School programme. Given the coexistence of these connotations, it seems reasonable to suggest that the concept of curriculum embodied two senses of the word 'order' - structural (cf. the 'order' of things) and sequential (cf. the 'order' of events. Thus, one explanation for its emergence in education is that it filled the semantic vacuum that existed between two contemporaneous synonyms - disciplina (cf. 'Disciplina Academiae Edinburgenae', 1628) and ratio (cf. 'Ordo et Ratio Studiorum', Glasgow, 1648).[29]

In the seventeenth century disciplina had connotations of 'order' in the structural rather than the sequential sense, whereas ratio studiorum meant a scheme of studies and was, therefore, closer to the idea of a sequential table of contents (cf. syllabus). In its evolved form, then, the 'curriculum' of an Arts degree embraced the constituent elements

of the course, both in theoretical terms (i.e. structurally) and in practical terms (i.e. as a sequence of teaching and learning activities).

If the foregoing analysis is correct, the question 'Why Glasgow?' can now be answered. The sense of discipline or structural order that was absorbed into curriculum came not so much from classical sources[30] as from the ideas of John Calvin (1509-1564). As Calvin's followers gained political as well as theological ascendancy in late sixteenth century Switzerland, Scotland and Holland, the idea of discipline - 'the very essense of calvinism'[31] - began to denote the internal principles and external machinery of civil government and personal conduct. From this perspective there is a homologous relationship between curriculum and discipline: curriculum was to calvinist educational practice as discipline was to calvinist social practice.

At a relatively late stage in our inquiry we came upon additional evidence for a link between calvinism and curriculum. We discovered the word curriculum in the 1582 statutes of the University of Leyden Again, the usage had an overarching connotation (viz. 'having completed the curriculum of his studies').[32] Again, too, there was a link with Geneva: Leyden was founded in 1575 specifically for the purpose of training calvinist preachers. As was the case with the refounding of Glasgow University by Andrew Melville, the establishment of Leiden attracted professors who brought with them 'the spirit of Geneva'[33] from Switzerland.

In view of the difficulty of tracing and obtaining sources, our account of the association of curriculum and calvinism must remain

hypothetical.[34] Nevertheless, we have tried to fill out the hypothesis with a causal explanation. Further support comes from another quarter : the association of curriculum and calvinism would also help to explain the apparent contradiction of the emergence of an educational ladder in a predominantly static society. For calvinists there was no contradiction. According to the doctrine of predestination, a certain section of society - the 'elect' - were singled out by divine grace for spiritual and social salvation, whereas the mass of humanity were rejected and damned to death. The adoption of the race-track metaphor crystallised these meritocratic calvinist aspirations. Schooling was for the many (irrespective of sex and social status) - but social acceleration up the educational ladder was merely for the few.

Summary and conclusions

The words class and curriculum seem to have entered educational discourse at the time when schooling was being transformed into a mass activity. In one sense, as Rashdall and Mir suggest, their introduction marks an important milestone is the reordering and formalisation of educational practice. More profoundly, we think, their emergence also raises a set of wider questions.

To what extent was the re-ordering of schooling related to the societal reordering of economic and power relationships at that time (cf. the different treatment of students at Bologna and Paris)? If the introduction of class and curriculum was associated with the rise of mass schooling, what part, in turn, did schooling play in the rise of mass (or commodity) production (cf. the interplay of economic and

educational factors in the schools supported by the Brethren of the Common Life)? Is there any relationship between the hierarchical segmentation of schooling and the spread of the division of labour in production - a concept which received its 'first considered exposition' in William Petty's Political Arithmetick (1690)?[35]
Did the curriculum notion, with its calvinist undertones, add ideas about the management of people to pre-existing assumptions about the organisation of knowledge (e.g. the trivium and quadrivium which go back to the fourth century[36])?

Clearly, the work reported in this paper cannot answer such questions with any authority. Yet besides shedding light on class and curriculum it may also serve as a contribution to the wider debates about the nature of pedagogy and the relationship between schools and society that prompted our own initial inquiries.

1. H. Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages (edited by F.M. Powicke and A.B. Emden), Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1936, vol.1, p.440

2. G.C. Mir, Aux Sources de la Pédagogie des Jésuites: "le Modus Parisiensis", Rome : Institutum Historicum S.I., 1968, p.160

3. G. Leff, Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, New York : John Wiley, 1968, p.116 ff.

4. The book that comes closest to providing both a theory and a history of pedagogy is H. Broudy & J. Palmer, Exemplars of Teaching Method, Chicago : Rand McNally, 1965. Its episodic structure, however, means that questions about the transition from one pedagogy to another are left unaddressed.

5. P. Ariès, Centuries of Childhood, New York : Random House, 1962, p.176 ff.

6. According to Ariès, Erasmus began using the word class in 1519. Nevertheless, there is an important unanswered question concerning Erasmus' role in its introduction. The word is missing from his two major educational works - De Copia (1512) and De Ratio Studii (1512) - despite the fact that Erasmus was 'heavily indebted' to Quintilian for their 'content and style'. (See B. McGregor's introduction to De Ratione Studii in the Collected Works of Erasmus, Toronto : Toronto University Press, Vol.24, 1978, p.663; and B. Knott (editor of De Copia), personal communication).
Although our paper is primarily concerned with the introduction of classis, there are of course an additional set of unanswered questions about its disappearance at the earlier date.

7. R. Goulet, Compendium on the University of Paris (translated by R.B. Burke), Philadelphia : University of Philadelphia Press, 1928, pp. 100-101. We are grateful to the Charles Patterson Van Pelt Library of the University of Pennsylvania for providing a photocopy of the original folio. There is also a copy of Goulet's book in the Bodlean Library, Oxford. Just as there are unresolved questions about the disappearance of classis, Goulet's work raises further questions about the transformation of a classical work meaning a group of people into a renaissance term meaning, in part, a teaching room.

8. Our summary of medieval schooling derives from the following:

J. Lawson, Medieval Education and the Reformation, London : Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967;

R.S. Rait, Life in the Medieval University, Cambridge : at the University Press, 1912; and

N. Orme, English Schools in the Middle Ages, London : Methuen, 1973.

9. Rashdall described the early teaching at Bologna in the following terms: 'The professor was not originally the officer of any public institution : he was simply a private adventure lecturer ... whom a number of independent gentlemen of all ages between seventeen and forty had hired to instruct them'
The University of Europe, pp. 149-150.

10. A.B. Cobban, The Medieval Universities : their Development and Organization, London : Methuen, 1975, p.63.

11. The dating of the emergence of courses as a 'fixed cycle of books' is not clear. Rashdall's judgement - the beginning of the thirteenth century - was questioned by his editors, who suggested an earlier date. The Universities of Europe, p.440
Neither party, however, distinguished between a cycle fixed by convention and a cycle fixed by legislation. To this extent both may be correct.

12. Cobban, The Medieval Universities, p.129.

13. To differentiate the collegiate systems of Paris and Oxford Cobban expressly used management criteria : 'the growth of the intercollegiate educational system at Paris in the late medieval period probably made for more effective utilisation of teachers and resources than the rather atomised, insular collegiate arrangements in England' (The Medieval Universities, p.131)

14. Mir, Aux Sources de la Pédagogie de Jésuites, p. 101.

15. Ibid., p.102.

16. For a discussion of some of the links between the Brethren of the Common Life and the University of Paris, see J.B. Herman, La Pedagogie des Jesuites aux XIVeme Siècle : ses Sources, ses characteristiques, Brussels; De Wit, 1914. Probably the most detailed recent review of the Brethren is R.R. Post's The Modern Devotion, Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1968. Some indication of the heretical precursers of the Brethren of the Common Life can be found in Norman Cohn's The Pursuit of the Millenium, (London : Maurice Temple, 1970). According to Cohn, the Brethren provided an 'outlet' (for heretical sentiments) within the limits of orthodoxy' (p.148).

17. A summary of the controversies surrounding the establishment of the Brethren can be found in R.W. Southern, Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages, Harmondsworth : Penguin Books, 1970, pp. 342-343. Southern also discusses a further novel feature of the Brethren - their strong belief in the virtue of work and their consequent aversion to begging (p.347).

18. As far as we can discover, the classical form of the word class had no hierarchical connotations. (see, for instance, A. Blaise, Lexicon Latinitatis Medii Aevi, Turnholt : Brepols, 1975; D.du Cange, Glossarium Mediae et Infirmae Latinitatis, London : Nutt, 1883; A. Ernout & A. Meillet, Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Lange Latine, Paris:Librairie Klincksieck, 1967; C. Lewis & C. Short, A Latin Dictionary, Oxford : At the Clarendon Press, 1966; J.F. Niermeyer, Mediae Latinitatis Lexicon Minus, Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1976; A. Souter, A Glossary of Later Latin, Oxford : At the Clarendon Press, 1949). Originally, classis referred to a cohort of men conscripted for military service. Later it denoted a fleet of ships. Given the ancestry of the term, there does not appear to be any necessary requirement that to distribute boys in classes is to distribute them hierarchically. Why, then, did Quintilian prefer classis over schola? Perhaps classis did, in fact, imply a sense of order and gradation that has not been reported by etymologists (cf. military ranks, the battle order of a fleet)?

19. A. Hyma, The Christian Renaissance (2nd Edition), Hamden, Connecticut : Archon Books, p.95. According to a nineteenth century historian, the size of the schools associated with the Brethren in the fourteenth century was as follows:

Zwolle (800-1000 students); Alkmaar (900); Herzogenbusch (1200); Deventer (2,200).

(J. Janssen, l'Allemagne et la Reforme (vol.1, Paris : Librairie Plon, 1887, p.19).
Both these assertions need to be treated with caution. We have not been able to check Hyma's source (M. Schoengen, Die Schule von Zwolle; Freiburg, 1898); and Janssen, like others, may have confused the number of boys in the Brethren's communities with the numbers in their schools (see Post, The Modern Devotion, p.386).

20. The relationship between presbyteries and classes is discussed in J. Moffat, The Presbyterian Churches, London : Methuen, 1928, pp. 51 & 133.

21. Material on the origin of classes in the organisation of the Methodist Church can be found in L.F. Church, The Early Methodist People, London : The Epworth Press, 1948, p.152 ff.

22. cf. Joseph Lancaster's statement: 'If only four or six boys should be found in a school...I think it would be advantageous for them to pursue their studies after the manner of a class. If the number of boys studying the same lesson in any school should amount to six, their proficiency will be nearly doubled by being classed'.

(Improvements in Education, London. Printed and sold by J. Lancaster, 1806, p.40).
Discussion of the emergence of classroom forms of organisation can be found in D. Hamilton, 'Classroom research and the evolution of the classroom system', 1978 (mimeo), ERIC No. ED.168139; and 'Adam Smith and the Moral Economy of the Classroom System', 1980 (mimeo).

23. The fact that schools winnowed scholars into relatively homogenous grades or classes helps to explain why the word class began to refer, by analogy, to the relatively homogenous social groups that took shape at the time of the Industrial Revolution (e.g. the 'working class'). For a discussion of the emergence of the concept of social class, see R. Williams, Keywords : a Vocabulary of Culture and Society, London : Fontana, 1976, p.51 ff.

24. Our search for etymological analyses of 'curriculum' yielded nothing from the following encyclopedia and dictionaries: F. Buisson, Dictionaire de Pédagogie (2 vols.), Paris : Hachette, 1882; P. Foulquie, Dictionaire de la Langue Pédagogique, Paris : PUF, 1971; P. Monroe (Ed.), A Cyclopedia of Education (5 vols.) New York : Macmillan, 1911; W. Rein (Ed.) Encyklopädisches Handbuch der Pedagogik (10 vols.), Langensalzer : Beyer, 1903; and F. Watson (Ed.), The Encyclopedia and Dictionary of Education (4 vols.), London : Pitman, 1921.
We would also like to acknowledge the help of our colleague John Durkan in this matter.

25. J.D. Mackie, The University of Glasgow 1451-1951, Glasgow : Jackson & Son, 1954, p.76. A full translation of Glasgow's charter of 1577 comprises appendix K. of J. Durkan & J. Kirk, The University of Glasgow 1451-1577, Glasgow : University of Glasgow Press, 1977.

26. Mackie, The University of Glasgow 1451-1951, p.76.

27. The earliest reference to curriculum occurs in a sample of the testimonial granted to a master,'vixit apud nos quadriennium totum nobilis (ingenuus) et pius adolescens N.M. honesto loco et legitimo thoro natus bonarumque artium et utriusque linguae Professoribus ita operam dedit toto curriculi spatio ut non minimus in eloquentiae et philosophiae studiis progressus fecerit...' Although the testimony is dated 1633, the published records of the University suggest that they were 'apparently promulgated soon after the grant of the great charter (i.e.1577)', Munimenta Alme Universitatus Glasguensis (Records of the University of Glasgow from its foundation till 1727), Glasgow : Published in four volumes by the Maitland Club, 1854, Vol.2., pp. 54 & X.

28. 'Quo die concilio facultatis artium habito statutum est neminem disciplinorum e schola grammaticorum Glasguensi in gymnasium admittendum esse qui non extremum curriculi in ista schola ex consensu moderatorum academiae instituti annum in suprema classe confecerit nisi ob graves rationes prius a consessu facultatis examinandas et approbandas', ibid, vol.2., p.307.

29. A. Morgan (Ed.), Charters, Statutes, and Acts of the Town Council and Senatus 1583-1858, Edinburgh : Oliver & Boyd, 1937; and Munimenta Alme Universitatis Glasguensis vol.2., p.316.

30. For etymological enquiries into the classical (i.e. greek and latin) concept of discipline, see K. Hoskin, 'Disciplina', Unpublished paper, Department of Education, University of Warwick, Coventry, England; and W. Dürig, 'Disciplina', Sacris Erudiri, 1952, 4, 245-279. Dürig notes that its origins are 'contested' (p.245).

31. See R.H. Tawney, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, Harmdsworth : Penguin Books, 1938, p.98. Surprisingly, M. Foucault's Discipline and Punish (Harmondsworth : Penguin Books, 1979) makes no mention of calvinism.

32. P.C. Molhuysen, Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis der Leidsche Universiteit, 's-Gravenhage, 1913-1924, Vol.2., p.96.

33. M.W. Jurriaanse, The Founding of Leyden University, Leiden : E.J. Brill, 1965, p.13.

34. The cumulative evidence of Glasgow and Leyden points, of course, to Geneva. To date we have not traced the word curriculum in the statutes of 1557, which were compiled before calvinism reached its maturity. A more likely source is the statutes of 1576 (which we have not yet seen). The statutes of 1557 are printed in C. Borgeaud, Histoire de l'Universite de Genève : l'Academie de Calvin 1559-1798, Geneva : Georg & Co., 1900, appendix 3).

One explanation of the possible later appearance of curriculum in Glasgow is that it came, not from Geneva in the 1570s but from Leyden. Certainly there were Scots in Leyden in 1596, 1600 and 1601 (see P.C. Molhuysen, Bronnen tot de Geschiedenis der Leidsche Universiteit, vol.2., sections 306 & 344; and T.H. Lunsingh Scheurleer & G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes (Eds.) Leiden University in the Seventeenth Century, Leiden : Universtaire Pers/E.J. Brill, 1975, pp.14 & 16.

35. See A. Smith An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations, (Edited by R.H. Campbell & A.S. Skinner), Oxford : Clarendon Press, 1976, Vol.1., p.13, footnote.

36. See Leff, Paris and Oxford Universities in the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries, p.118.